UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,803	01/14/2004	James McSwiggen	SIR-MIS-00001-US-CIP[4]	5421

79693 7590 05/17/2010

Merck
c/o Sirna Therapeutics, Inc.
1700 Owens Street
4th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94158

EXAMINER
BOWMAN, AMY HUDSON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1635	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/17/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

eva_santana@merck.com
marilyn_moy@merck.com
catherine_naughton@merck.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/757,803	MCSWIGGEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	AMY BOWMAN	1635	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 April 2010*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *18-20 and 33-49* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *18-20 and 33-49* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *14 January 2004* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Application/Amendment/Claims

Applicant's response filed 4/22/10 has been considered. Rejections and/or objections not reiterated from the previous office action mailed 11/3/09 (and examiner's answer 4/13/10) are hereby withdrawn. The following rejections and/or objections are either newly applied or are reiterated and are the only rejections and/or objections presently applied to the instant application.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/22/10 has been entered.

Applicant has added claims 40-49. Therefore, claims 18-20 and 33-49 are pending in the application.

Applicant's arguments filed on 4/22/10 have been fully considered but are not persuasive as explained below. The rejections below are pending/modified (due to claim amendments) or newly applied based upon the instant claim amendments.

Priority

Applicant's claim for the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or under 35 U.S.C. 120, 121, or 365(c) is acknowledged. Applicant has not complied with one or more conditions for receiving the benefit of an earlier filing date under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) or 120 as follows:

The later-filed application must be an application for a patent for an invention which is also disclosed in the prior application (the parent or original nonprovisional application or provisional application). The disclosure of the invention in the parent application and in the later-filed application must be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112. See *Transco Products, Inc. v. Performance Contracting, Inc.*, 38 F.3d 551, 32 USPQ2d 1077 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

None of the prior-filed applications teach the following limitations: a siNA molecule wherein each strand is 18-24 nucleotides in length and the nucleic acid molecule comprises between 17 and 23 base pairs; in combination with each of the instantly recited modifications.

Upon a review of 60/358,580, for example, the instant length limitations are disclosed on page 11 as being specific for the structures of Formula I, II, III, and IV; wherein the instant modification schematics are elements of other embodiments.

Therefore, the instant claims are accorded the priority date of 1/14/04, which is the filing date of the instant application, as further explained in the new matter rejection below.

Upon a review of the priority documents, support for the limitations set forth above is not evident in the context of the instant claims. Should applicant disagree, applicants are encouraged to point out with particularity by page and line number where such support might exist for each claim limitation in each of the claimed priority documents specifically in the combined context as claimed.

Applicant points to various passages of the instant specification for support for the instant claim elements. Applicant points to page 73, lines 1-5 for support for the limitations of part b) of instant claim 18. However, the passage clearly discloses an embodiment wherein each strand is 18 to 24 nucleotides in length and then "another embodiment" wherein the siNA comprises 17 to 23 base pairs. The instant claims combine two embodiments of the specification that are clearly set forth as separate embodiments, i.e. directed to separate molecules. The claims as drafted embrace a siNA, for example that is 24 nucleotides in length with 17 base pairs, which is clearly not supported by the instant specification.

The same is true for the priority documents relied upon by applicant.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 18-20 and 33-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a new matter rejection.

The instant specification does not support a siNA molecule wherein each strand is 18-24 nucleotides in length and the nucleic acid molecule comprises between 17 and 23 base pairs; in combination with each of the instantly recited modifications.

Applicant points to various passages of the instant specification for support for the instant claim elements. Applicant points to page 73, lines 1-5 for support for the limitations of part b) of instant claim 18. However, the passage clearly discloses an embodiment wherein each strand is 18 to 24 nucleotides in length and then "another embodiment" wherein the siNA comprises 17 to 23 base pairs. The instant claims combine two embodiments of the specification that are clearly set forth as separate embodiments, i.e. directed to separate molecules. The claims as drafted embrace a siNA, for example that is 24 nucleotides in length with 17 base pairs, which is clearly not supported by the instant specification.

Upon a review of the instant specification, support is not evident for this particular combination of elements.

MPEP §2163.06 notes:

If new matter is added to the claims, the examiner should reject the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph - written description requirement. In re Rasmussen, 650 F.2d 1212, 211 USPQ 323 (CCPA 1981).

MPEP §2163.02 teaches that:

Whenever the issue arises, the fundamental factual inquiry is whether a claim defines an invention that is clearly conveyed to those skilled in the art at the time the application was filed...If a claim is amended to include subject matter, limitations, or terminology not present in the application as filed, involving a departure from, addition to, or deletion from the disclosure of the application as filed, the examiner should conclude that the claimed subject matter is not described in that application.

A review of the specification does not reveal support for where the claim amendments are found. Should applicant disagree, applicants are encouraged to point out with particularity by page and line number where such support might exist for the specific embodiment as instantly claimed.

There is no support for this claim limitation in the claimed priority documents. Therefore, the effective filing date of the instant claims is considered, for purposes of prior art, to be 1/14/04, which is the filing date of the instant application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 18-20 and 33-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Elbashir et al. (The EMBO Journal, 2001, Vol. 20, No. 23, pages 6877-6888), in view of Matulic-Adamic et al. (US 5,998,203), Parrish et al. (Molecular Cell, Vol. 6, pages 1077-1087, 2000), and Crooke (US 5,898,031), for the reasons of record and as explained below.

It is noted that the references are of record and cited on the PTO-892 mailed on 12/21/06.

The invention of the above claims is drawn to a chemically modified double stranded nucleic acid comprising a sense strand and an antisense strand, wherein each strand is 18 to 27 nucleotides in length, 18 to 23 nucleotides of each strand are complementary to each other, and at least 18 nucleotides of the antisense strand are complementary to a target RNA sequence, and the sense strand comprises a terminal

cap moiety at the 5' and 3' end. The invention is further drawn to specific terminal cap moieties, as well as modifications to the duplex and a composition comprising the double stranded nucleic acid and a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier or diluent.

Elbashir et al. (EMBO) teach siRNAs, wherein each strand is 21-23 nucleotides in length and wherein at least 19 nucleotides of the sense strand are complementary to the antisense strand. Elbashir et al. teach chemical modification with 2'-deoxy or 2'-O-methyl modifications. Elbashir et al. teach modification of 19% of the nucleotides of a duplex 21 nucleotides in length with 2'-deoxy modifications.

Elbashir et al. teach duplexes with 2 nt 3' overhangs, as well as blunt ended duplexes wherein all 21 nucleotides are complementary between the sense and antisense strand. Elbashir et al. teach that duplexes 21 nucleotides in length with 2 nt 3' overhangs were the most efficient triggers of sequence-specific mRNA degradation. Elbashir et al. teach duplexes wherein the sense and antisense strands are complementary at 19 or 21 nucleotide positions (see for example, Figure 1D (1^{st} duplex) and Figure 1F (1^{st} duplex)). Elbashir et al. teach 2'-deoxythymidine in the 3' overhang (see page 6884). The 100% modified duplex taught by Elbashir et al. is considered to not comprise ribonucleotides.

Elbashir et al. do not teach double stranded nucleic acid molecules comprising the instantly recited terminal cap moieties and do not teach 2'-deoxy-2'-fluoro or phosphorothioate modifications. Elbashir et al. do not teach a composition comprising the double stranded nucleic acid molecule and a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier.

Matulic-Adamic et al. teach chemical modifications of double stranded nucleic acid structures. The enzymatic RNA molecules of Matulic-Adamic et al. are taught to be targeted to virtually any RNA transcript and achieve efficient cleavage (see column 1) and to be sufficiently complementary to a target sequence to allow cleavage. Matulic-Adamic et al. teach the incorporation of chemical modifications at the 5' and/or 3' ends of the nucleic acids to protect the enzymatic nucleic acids from exonuclease degradation, which improves the overall effectiveness of the nucleic acid, as well as facilitates uptake of the nucleic acid molecules (see column 2). Matulic-Adamic et al. teach base, sugar and/or phosphate modification, as well as terminal cap moieties at the 5'-cap, 3'-cap, or both. Specifically, 3' phosphorothioates, inverted abasic moieties, and 2'-O-methyl modifications are utilized. Matulic-Adamic et al. teach 2'deoxy nucleotides and 2'-deoxy-2'-halogen nucleotides, wherein Br, CL and F are representative halogens (see column 3, for example). For example, figure 3 contains a ribozyme structure that encompasses modification of at least 20%, at least 30%, at least 40% or at least 50% of the nucleotide positions, as well as the modifications instantly claimed. The modifications can be in one or both of the strands and can be modifications of different types within the same structure.

Matulic-Adamic et al. teach that preferred caps include 4', 5'-methylene nucleotides, 1-(beta-D-erythrofuranosyl) nucleotides, 4'-thio nucleotides, 1,5-anhydrohexitol nucleotides, L-nucleotides, threo-pentofuranosyl nucleotides, acyclic 3', 4'-seco nucleotides, 3,4-dihydroxybutyl nucleotides, 3,5-dihydroxypentyl nucleotides, 3'-3'-inverted nucleotide moieties, 3'-3'-inverted abasic moieties, 3'-2'-inverted nucleotide

moieties, 3'-2'-inverted abasic moieties, 5'-5'-inverted nucleotide moieties, and 5'-5'-inverted abasic moieties (see columns 3 and 4, for example). Matulic-Adamic et al. teach compositions comprising the nucleic acid and reaction buffer, which is a diluent.

Parrish et al. teach a chemically synthesized siRNA molecule, wherein each strand is 26 bp in length. Additionally, Parrish et al. teach a 742 nt long dsRNA with extensive modification with 2'-deoxy-2'-fluoro modifications, which resulted in successful RNA interference. Parrish teaches that the 2'-deoxy-2'-fluoro modifications incorporated into the long dsRNA produces unc-22 interference and furthermore described the interference as strong (+++, see figure 5).

Crooke teaches gapmer oligonucleotide chemistry and teaches that gapmer strategies increase oligonucleotide affinity to the target RNA (see column 9, for example). Crooke teaches chemical modifications that are incorporated to improve pharmacokinetic binding, absorption, distribution or clearance properties of the compound, affinity or specificity of the compound to target RNA, or modification of the charge of the compound (see column 7, for example).

Crooke teach that a particularly useful 2'-substituent group for increasing the binding affinity is the 2'-fluoro group (see column 12). Crooke also teaches 2'-O-methyl modifications.

It would have been obvious to synthesize a double stranded nucleic acid molecule with the structural characteristics taught by Elbashir et al., wherein the molecule is formulated in a composition with a diluent, as taught by Matulic-Adamic et

al. It would have been obvious to incorporate the specific modifications taught by Parrish et al. and Matulic-Adamic et al.

One would have been motivated to synthesize a double stranded nucleic acid molecule, as taught by Elbashir et al. (EMBO), wherein the molecule is formulated in a composition with a diluent, because Matulic-Adamic et al. teach successful inhibition of target gene expression with nucleic acid molecules formulated in a diluent. Furthermore, the reactions performed by Elbashir et al. require diluents such as buffers and water.

One would have been motivated to synthesize a double stranded nucleic acid molecule, as taught by Elbashir et al. (EMBO), with the modifications taught by Parrish et al. and Matulic-Adamic et al. because each of the modifications were known in the art to protect nucleic acids from exonuclease degradation, which improves the overall effectiveness of the nucleic acid, as well as facilitates uptake of the nucleic acid molecules, as taught by Matulic-Adamic et al. Additionally, Parrish et al. and Matulic-Adamic et al. teach extensive chemical modification of long dsRNA and ribozymes, respectively, with successful inhibition of target gene expression.

Since Elbashir et al. (EMBO), Matulic-Adamic et al., and Parrish et al. teach modified double stranded nucleic acid molecules that inhibit target gene expression, and Crooke teaches gapmer oligonucleotide chemistry to improve pharmacokinetic properties of the oligonucleotide, one would have been motivated to synthesize duplexes, as taught by Elbashir et al., with each of the instantly recited modifications, as

taught by Elbashir et al., Matulic-Adamic et al., and Parrish et al. in order to optimize the activity of the molecule, as taught by Crooke.

Additionally, antisense oligonucleotides, ribozymes, and dsRNAs are each commonly used for sequence-specific mRNA knockdown and each of these encounters delivery problems for effective application. Therefore, one would have been motivated to utilize the same modifications and techniques that have been utilized to overcome these problems with antisense oligonucleotides or ribozymes with siRNAs to add the same benefits to RNAi technology.

For example, Crooke teaches that gapmer oligonucleotide chemistry has provided antisense oligonucleotides with increased target affinity and pharmacokinetic properties. Crooke teaches that different modifications at different regions of the oligonucleotide have been tested in order to optimize oligonucleotide activity. Crooke teaches stepwise experimentation of modifications throughout oligonucleotides in order to find the optimal configuration. Crooke is relied upon as evidence that it is common to experiment with different known modifications at different locations to optimize oligonucleotide activity.

It would have been prima facie obvious to perform routine optimization to determine which of the known modifications or combinations of modifications are optimal. As noted in *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233 at 235,

> More particularly, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.

Routine optimization is not considered inventive and no evidence has been presented that the selection of the specific modifications used were other than routine, that the products resulting from the optimization have any unexpected properties, or that the results should be considered unexpected in any way as compared to the closest prior art.

Therefore, one would have been motivated to apply such a method to incorporate known modifications at various locations (i.e. regions/positions of duplex or pyrimidine v. purine) and amounts, as taught by Crooke, into the siRNA duplexes that were synthesized by Elbashir et al.

Finally, one would have a reasonable expectation of success given that each of the modifications were known in the art at the time the invention was made to add benefits to antisense oligonucleotides, ribozymes, dsRNAs or siRNA duplexes, as evidenced by Elbashir et al., Matulic-Adamic et al., Parrish et al. and Crooke, wherein each of the molecules face the same challenges, and each of which can be improved with modifications. Since Crooke teaches effectively walking modifications across antisense oligonucleotides to optimize the location of the modifications and activity of the oligonucleotide and Elbashir et al., Matulic-Adamic et al., and Parrish et al. teach successfully synthesizing modified double stranded nucleic acid molecules, one would reasonably expect for each of the modifications to benefit the double stranded nucleic acid molecules of Elbashir et al. as well. Furthermore, the long chemically modified dsRNA taught by Parrish et al. further demonstrate that extensively modified dsRNA molecules result in RNA interference activity. Since Elbashir et al., Matulic-Adamic et

al., and Parrish et al. teach modification of double stranded nucleic acid molecules and Crooke teaches experimentally determining optimal locations and levels of modification of antisense oligonucleotides, incorporating each of the modifications in the double stranded nucleic acid molecules of Elbashir et al. is considered within the realm of routine optimization.

It is noted that Elbashir et al. teach that 100% modification of one or both strands with 2'-deoxy or 2'-O-methyl modifications abolished activity. However, regardless of the results of these specific modifications at 100% of the positions of one or both strands, Elbashir et al. did modify duplexes and published data regarding successful inhibition with some duplexes and unsuccessful inhibition with others, supporting that testing of such known chemical modifications is routine in the art. The results of Elbashir et al. are considered to offer motivation to incorporate chemical modifications at various percentages to optimize the activity of the duplex because not all modifications result in activity at every percentage.

Thus in the absence of evidence to the contrary, the invention as a whole would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made.

Response to Arguments

Applicant continues to argue the interpretation of the Elbashir et al. reference and argues that the instant claims require more extensive modification than the claims of US

7,022,828, wherein the board has already interpreted the article. However, the instant claims require a total of 10 pyrimidines between the sense and antisense strand to be modified (diminimus of the claim), which is an extension of one nucleotide on each 3' end being modified when compared to Elbashir et al., wherein the board agreed that Elbashir et al. is silent as to data between 19% modification of the duplex and 100% modification of one or both strands.

It is noted that the interpretation of the Elbashir et al. (Tuschl) reference is argued in detail by applicant. However, the interpretation of the article has already been decided by the Board in the related appeal (Reexamination control 90/008,177, Patent 7,022,858), and the interpretation is consistent with that of the examiner in the instant rejection.

On page 27 of the decision, the board sets forth that appellant's argument that Tuschl teaches avoiding any 2'-O-methyl modifications is unpersuasive and misstates the teachings of Tuschl. A fair reading is that more extensive 2'-deoxy or 2'-O-methyl modification beyond the two nucleotide 3'-overhang reduces the ability of siRNAs to mediate RNAi. Stating that complete substitution abolished RNAi is not the same of stating that any 2'-O-methyl modification should be avoided. It is noted that when incorporating chemical modifications into nucleic acid inhibitory molecules, it is routine to balance stability and activity. Therefore, it is a matter of routine optimization to determine an acceptable balance between a reduction in activity and an increase in stability, as long as the molecule is still in fact active.

The decision also sets forth that nucleic acid molecules are known to be degraded or hydrolyzed by nucleases *in vivo* and in culture systems and thus it is routine in the art to modify nucleic acids to resist nuclease hydrolysis, and particularly to modify with modifications that were known to enhance stability. Similarly, capping as disclosed by Matulic-Adamic et al. would be reasonably expected to sterically interfere with the active site of a nuclease (see page 25 of decision, for example).

Applicant argues that there would not have been a reasonable expectation of success. Contrary to applicant's argument, this is not true given the instantly claimed genus. It was well within the technical grasp of the skilled artisan to combine chemical modifications that were known and routinely used to enhance stability of nucleic acid therapeutic molecules to arrive at molecules within he instantly claimed genus that would likely have activity, as it was known in the art to balance stability and activity via routinely testing different combinations/quantities of such modifications.

Importantly, the instant claims are not directed to any specific target sequence and only require 10 pyrimidine modifications collectively between both strands. Therefore, depending on the target sequence, the diminimus of the instant claim breadth is only a difference between one modification on each strand because Elbashir et al. teaches the incorporation of 8 modified positions. Therefore, although applicant continues to argue that Elbashir et al. teaches away, this simply is not the case.

The only modified duplexes that exhibit abolished activity in the Elbashir et al. reference are 100% modified. Elbashir et al. is evidence that incorporation of such chemical modifications into siRNA molecules results in active molecules in some

configurations and inactive molecules in others, supporting that routine optimization is needed. Furthermore, Elbashir et al. is evidence that modification is well tolerated in the terminal portions of the duplex, offering further motivation to modify the terminal regions. Elbashir et al. teaches that some modification does not affect RNAi, but helps to reduce the cost of RNA synthesis and may enhance RNase resistance of siRNA duplexes (see page 6885, column 1). Applicant argues that Elbashir only succeeded at modifying a single terminal region on each strand. Importantly, this is all that Elbashir et al. tested and therefore does not teach away from incorporating terminal modifications at the other end. Since the modifications were tolerated on the one end, one would have been motivated to incorporate them on the other end. Again, applicant is not claiming any specific configuration of modifications, but is rather claiming a genus of modification types or combinations thereof at various positions depending on the target sequence.

Applicant argues that a specific pattern is being claimed because the size range is set forth, caps are present, and 10 or more pyrimidines of the sense and antisense strand collectively are modified. Contrary to applicant's assertion regarding a static pattern, the claims embrace modification with any of three types of modifications or any combination of the three at 10 to 24 positions, wherein the positions vary depending upon the target sequence (positioning of pyrimidines).

Applicant argues that the examiner uses impermissible hindsight to support the assertion that one of skill would have had a reasonable expectation of success in generating highly modified duplexes that retain RNAi activity. Although applicant

continues to argue motivation to extensively modify, the instant claims require a total of 10 pyrimidine modifications out of a total of 24 nucleotides. Applicant argues elements that are not claimed. Furthermore, the claims are directed to incorporation of modifications that are each known in the art to enhance stability of nucleic acid inhibitory molecules at a large genus of possible combinations/positions (based upon target sequence) with no required activity. With regards to pyrimidine modifications, Parrish et al. teaches extensive pyrimidine modification with strong interference activity and there are only two choices of places to modify, purine or pyrimidine.

Applicant argues that the instant claims are directed to nucleic acid molecules with extensive modifications at specific positions and specific types of nucleotides. It is noted that the only position specific modification that is instantly claimed are terminal caps, which by nature are located in terminal positions. It was known and routine in the art to incorporate terminal cap moieties into nucleic acid inhibitory molecules, as set forth in the instant rejection. Regarding types of nucleotides, there is a finite number of choices for the modifications of the prior art to be incorporated at, purines or pyrimidines. It is certainly within the realm of routine optimization/design choice to incorporate the modifications at a purine or a pyrimidine, given that there are only two choices. Furthermore, the claims are not directed to any specific pattern of modification that has demonstrated any unexpected property, given that the claims embrace combinations of modifications at different positions depending on the target sequence. The quantity of purines or pyrimidines is entirely target sequence specific, although the instant claims are not closed to any specific target.

Applicant argues that the instant invention consists of novel and non-obvious combinations of features giving rise to surprising and unexpected results. Contrary to applicant's argument, applicant has not demonstrated any unexpected result of the instantly claimed genus. Applicant points to species in the specification that fall within a very large genus, wherein the species are not commensurate in scope with the instant claim breadth. One would expect incorporation of 10 pyrimidine modifications, wherein the position is dependent on the target sequence, within a dsRNA molecule of the instant size range to yield some level of activity, given that this is only 2 more modifications then demonstrated by Elbashir et al. The instant modifications can be selected from 2'-deoxy, 2'-O-methyl, or 2'-deoxy-2'-flouro (or any combination thereof), which are each very common modifications in the nucleic acid inhibitor art, more specifically in the dsRNA art, as evidenced by Elbashir et al. and Parrish et al.

Applicant argues that there would not have been a reasonable expectation of success. Contrary to applicant's argument, this is not true given the instantly claimed genus. It was well within the technical grasp of the skilled artisan to combine chemical modifications that were known and routinely used to enhance stability of nucleic acid therapeutic molecules to arrive at molecules within he instantly claimed genus that would likely have activity, as it was known in the art to balance stability and activity via routinely testing different combinations/quantities of such modifications.

It is noted again that there are only two options to incorporate the instant modifications, purine or pyrimidine; and the instant claims require a total of 10

modifications out of a possible 24 positions. Applicant continues to broadly argue "extensive" modification, rather than directing the arguments to the instant claim scope.

Applicant points to *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.* (127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007)) to argue that the instant claims are directed to a new combination wherein the result cannot be predicted. As explained above, the instant claims are directed to a huge genus of modifications and combinations thereof, wherein the schematic is entirely target sequence specific. One would have been motivated to combine the prior-art elements and expect active molecules within the instant claim breadth. It is well within the grasp of the skilled artisan to select and combine known elements within the instant huge genus and to expect active molecules upon routine optimization of the placement of such modifications given the teachings in the nucleic acid inhibitor art. It is the routine optimization of the placement of the modifications that is relied upon for determining activity of such molecules, as it was known to perform such routine testing, as evidenced by Elbashir et al. and Crooke.

In view of *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, when a combination of admittedly old elements produces a new and beneficial result never attained before, it is evidence of invention. However, in the instant case applicant is not claiming any specific combination or modification schematic that produces an unexpected result, but is rather claiming a huge genus of possible molecules wherein molecules within the genus are certainly considered obvious in view of the teachings of the prior art.

The mere selection of elements from various prior art references and combining them together with no new function is an obvious use of common sense by one skilled

in the art and therefore not patentable. Furthermore, the instant claims are compound claims with no specific function required.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In *re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 18-20 and 33-49 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 33-50 of copending Application No. 10/923,536. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because both sets of claims are directed to chemically modified double stranded nucleic acid molecules with overlapping structural characteristics and modifications. The instant molecules are not designed to

be targeted to any specific target RNA sequence and are therefore obvious in view of the claims of application '536 that recite molecules with overlapping structural characteristics.

Application '536 recites double stranded nucleic acid molecules that comprise a sense and an antisense strand, wherein the antisense region is about 16 to about 25 nucleotides and the sense region is about 3 to about 15 nucleotides in length. Application '536 recites 2'-deoxy, 2'-deoxy-2'-fluoro, 2'-O-methyl, and LNA modifications at varying amounts in one or both strands, as well as terminal cap moieties including inverted deoxy abasic moieties. Application '536 recites terminal cap moieties at the 5'-end, 3'-end or both ends of the sense strand and the 3' end of the antisense strand. Application '536 recites a composition comprising the nucleic acid molecule in a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier or diluent. Therefore, the instant claims are obvious in view of the claims of application '536.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Applicant requests that this rejection be held in abeyance until such time when it becomes the sole remaining rejection.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to AMY BOWMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-0755. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fereydoun G. Sajjadi can be reached on (571) 272-3311. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AMY BOWMAN
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1635

/AMY BOWMAN/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1635